

Project Startup Report

Presented to the IT Committee January 18, 2008

Project Name: Project Management Information System

Agency: North Dakota – Enterprise Project

Business Unit/Program Area: Enterprise Project Management Office

Project Sponsor: Mike Ressler, ITD Director

Project Manager: Mark Molesworth, EPM

Project Description

The Project Management Advisory Group has been conducting several initiatives to promote the quality of project management across the enterprise. This began with an initiative to develop a scalable, enterprise-wide project management methodology. After publishing the methodology, the EPM Advisory Group was able to reach consensus on STD009-05, the standard for project management of large information technology projects. In early 2005, two additional initiatives occurred in an effort to promote a career path in project management. The National Information Technology Apprenticeship System (NITAS) was adopted to promote a complete training and development program which included training, on the job experience, mentoring and skills validation, and certification. Simultaneously, the EPM Advisory Group developed a proposed job classification series for project managers which included three levels. This would allow potential candidates to enter the field in a lower, apprenticeship-style role and grow into a fully qualified project manager.

Each of the aforementioned initiatives has been a critical building block in the development of North Dakota's project management model. It was important that each of these components occurs prior to implementing a project management toolset. However, during this process, several agencies and higher education have taken steps toward funding and/or implementing a toolset. While no major implementations have occurred to date, agencies are ready to do so if no enterprise toolset is made available.

Charter 1 involved requirements gathering, RFI development, and cost estimating. This provided ITD and the anchor agencies with a general estimate to include in the 2007-2009 budget request. In addition, agencies were provided with general licensing and hosting costs for budgetary purposes. The anchor agencies, including ITD, DHS, JSND, WSI, and DOT, agreed that it was appropriate to continue to Charter 2. In addition, there was a request to begin the process early so agencies with roll-up dollars might leverage those funds toward this project prior to the end of the 2005-2007 biennia.

Charter 2 includes a formal RFP selection process, acquisition, implementation, configuration, support, and end-user training of an enterprise project management information system.

Business Need or Problem

With the evolution of project management in North Dakota state government and higher education (e.g. North Dakota state project management guidebook, project management training, etc.), the need exists for an enterprise-wide project management tool set to support the application of project management principles and methodologies. The absence of a comprehensive tool set leads to a lack of:

- Integration between scope, schedule, cost, quality, issue, risk, change, and acceptance management which are presently being met by the use of a variety of individual tool sets.
- integrated records management and historical documentation
- consistent reporting capabilities to comply with existing standards and laws
- ability to evaluate project health and forecast effect of variances
- ability to conduct enterprise trend and historical statistical analysis
- enterprise training / cross-training opportunities
- collaboration tools – team portals or dashboards
- project portfolio management (e.g. resource allocation)
- enhanced reporting capabilities.

Project Startup Report

Presented to the IT Committee January 18, 2008

| Key Metrics | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|
| Project Start Date | Estimated Length of Project | Estimated Cost |
| July 2007 | March 2008 | \$283,030 |

| Benefits to Be Achieved | |
|--|---|
| Project Objectives | Measurement Description |
| <p>Increase/Improve project communications.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide uniform collaboration tools – team portals or dashboards 2. Develop enhanced reporting capabilities. | <p>1A. The toolset provides effective and efficient communication via team portals or dashboards (measurement on a Likert Scale)</p> <p>1B. Within 3 months of full implementation, 25% of all Large Information Technology projects that utilize the toolset will establish and utilize team portals or dashboards as a management tool. Within 1 year, the percentage will increase to 75%.</p> <p>2A. Reports and/or dashboards will be created that provide automated, real time reporting of budget and schedule data to provide alignment with NDCC 54-35-15.3, NDCC 54-59-23, and STD009-05.</p> |
| <p>Improve resource management.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project portfolio management (e.g. resource allocation) | <p>1A. Automated resource allocation information</p> <p>1B. Automated time recording to project tasks will eliminate the manual update of Microsoft Project data allowing the Project Managers to analyze rather than input data.</p> |

Project Startup Report

Presented to the IT Committee January 18, 2008

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Allow for better strategic decision making.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Integrated records management and historical documentation 2. Ability to evaluate project health and forecast effect of variances 3. Ability to conduct enterprise trend and historical statistical analysis | <p>1A. Provide the technology and business process for a uniform document management system which allows for retrieval and analysis of historical information. Presently there is no enterprise standard for project document retention or sharing of historical information.</p> <p>2A. Automate the project CSSQ management areas and provide analysis tools to identify problems and exceptions. This will occur through the elimination of shadow systems, spreadsheets, and external databases. In addition, automate the forecast of impacts based on those exceptions.</p> <p>3.A Provide the ability for 2009-2011 biennium projects to provide end-to-end total cost of project budgeting from the appropriation request through project completion.</p> |
| <p>Provide continuity of project management practices across the enterprise.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Integration between scope, schedule, cost, quality, issue, risk, change, and acceptance management which are presently being met by the use of a variety of individual tool sets. 2. Consistent reporting capabilities to comply with existing standards and laws 3. Maximize enterprise training / cross-training opportunities | <p>1A. No baseline for the effort to conduct these processes exists for the manual process. Implementation will be a yes/no measurement. Human capital efficiencies can be measured via the post implementation survey and subsequent measurements up to one year post project.</p> <p>2A. Reports and/or dashboards will be created that provide automated, real time reporting of budget and schedule data to provide alignment with NDCC 54-35-15.3, NDCC 54-59-23, and STD009-05</p> <p>3A. Reduced cost of training will be achieved via the RFP process by volume training, training for trainers, and competitive bidding.</p> |

Project Startup Report

Presented to the IT Committee January 18, 2008

Cost/Benefit Analysis

Due to the lack of baseline data regarding both time spent and time lost by project managers, team members, executives, etc. utilizing the various decentralized project management tools, a Delphi Technique was the approach utilized to conduct the Cost/Benefit Analysis. Members of the EPM Advisory Group were collectively in agreement that the benefits to be derived from the project (see above) were deemed to outweigh the cost of the project (\$273,030).

Key Constraints or Risks

The following business risks were identified.

- Lack of agency consensus.
- Lack of or inconsistent funding across agencies.
- Lack of agency buy-in for enterprise-wide tool.
- Lack of Legislative buy-in.
- Lack of agency commitment of resources.
- Inability to show tangible Return On Investment.

The following constraints were identified.

- Key staff resources will be intermittently unavailable during implementation.
- Training for non-project managers is limited to on-line training and mentoring.
- Project technical staff will not be experienced with the operating environment.